97-84131-8

Coler, Bird Sim

The residuary sect

Brooklyn

1911

97-84131-8
MASTER NEGATIVE #

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
PRESERVATION DIVISION

BIBLIOGRAPHIC MICROFORM TARGET

ORIGINAL MATERIAL AS FILMED - EXISTING BIBLIOGRAPHIC RECORD

308
Z
Box 537

Coler, Bird Sim, 1867–1941

... The residuary sect, by Bird S. Coler. Brooklyn, The Eastern press, 1911.

19, [1] p. 24cm. ~~$0.10~~

At head of title: Socialism in the schools, pamphlet no. 2.

1. Religious education. 2. Socialism in U. S.

Library of Congress HX526.C6 11-13217/3
1/4/91
Copyright A 287840

RESTRICTIONS ON USE: *Reproductions may not be made without permission from Columbia University Libraries.*

TECHNICAL MICROFORM DATA

FILM SIZE: 35mm REDUCTION RATIO: 11:1 IMAGE PLACEMENT: IA (IIA) IB IIB

DATE FILMED: 7/7/97 INITIALS: TLM / PB

TRACKING # : 25647

FILMED BY PRESERVATION RESOURCES, BETHLEHEM, PA.

Exam copy all I have
could be bike

SOCIALISM IN THE SCHOOLS
Pamphlet No. 2.

THE RESIDUARY SECT

BY

BIRD S. COLER

3.18
Z
B 4537

PUBLISHED BY
THE EASTERN PRESS
445 FIFTY-FIFTH STREET, BROOKLYN
M CM XI

Price 10 cents.

C.
J.C. Egbert
11/26/40

Copyright, 1911, by
BIRD S. COLER

DEC 3 1940 EB

THE RESIDUARY SECT

WHEN I circulated "Socialism in the Schools," I had no idea how sensitive was the nerve I touched. It has surprised me to learn how general, geographically, is the interest in this subject; how strong and wide-spread is the sentiment against the Godless school and the use of the school for the propaganda of Socialism. Letters have come to me from lawyers, business men, educators, clergymen, college presidents; not all of them concurrent either as to the cause of the lifeless morality of our school system, or the remedy; but all of them centering upon the point *that there is something wrong* in the education given in our public schools.

Of these letters, one of the earliest and most interesting was from the president of an important educational institution, a cultured, capable, upright, and patriotic citizen of the United States. He believes with all the splendid sincerity of his soul that he is an unsectarian Christian. My own humble thought is that there is no such thing; that as soon as a thing has life, it takes some inclination; only the dead things are neutral. An illustration might be the difficulties our language-makers are having finding an acceptable word for a thing that is neither moral nor immoral. My friend is neither Methodist nor Baptist nor Catholic nor Lutheran—an Eliot-

onian, perhaps; he belongs, therefore, to my mind, in the Residuary Sect. And the Residuary Sect, I find, is just as sectarian as any of the others. If there could be any better, any clearer illustration of the impossibility of *compromise* as a remedy for the Godless schools than this letter, written by a man of fine mind and character and splendid purpose, I cannot imagine it. I have thought it might help in the general discussion to publish this letter and the answer that occurred to me. This is the letter:

I thank you for sending me your thoughtful and thought-provoking pamphlet on "Socialism in the Schools."

You have done a public service in thus calling attention to the important subject of religious education. With much that you say I am in entire accord. I feel as strongly as you do the absurdity and criminality of laboriously excluding from the public schools all official reference to the fundamental principles of the Christian religion.

I should be inclined to ask for a more careful definition of some of the terms that you use. It does n't seem to me that Socialism is the enemy. In this community it is the Jews and the cowardice of politicians trembling before the Jewish vote and the Jewish purse that have banished the name of Jesus from the public schools. Many of the Jews care little about it, but others do, especially the orthodox Jews, and they have made a fuss several times within the last five years. Our Christian people should have insisted that this is a Christian country and that it should have Christian schools. In my judgment it would be feasible, even here in New York City, to obtain an agreement between representative Jewish and Christian leaders of opinion that would define the religious teaching and Bible reading in the schools which would be acceptable to the great majority of both Jews and Christians.

I am confident that such an agreement would be found to include all the fundamentals of religious belief and practice which are common to the great religions of the world, and on these the moral law is amply based. You seem to think that creeds and theologies should be taught in the schools. In detail they belong to the family circle and to the Sunday-school, if I am a judge of what is needed. Religious teaching in the home is even more weakened nowadays than in the schools, and there should be a crusade to strengthen the sense of parental responsibility.

Religion is love to God and love to man. Every good teacher inculcates both these lessons every day, even though the duty be not mentioned in the course of study. But theology—the formulation of the relations between metaphysics and ethics—belongs in the Church and the Home, and has no proper place in the common school.

Your proposition is to return to the usage of a hundred years ago, or three hundred years ago, and give the primary control of the schools and the teachers to the churches. As the Germans say, "You are throwing away the baby with the bath."

Because formal religious teaching is too much eliminated, shall we swing to the other extreme and make the schools subservient to different doctrines of theology? The Catholics would like it, for it would give their parochial schools a share of the public money, but the American people, as a whole, will never sanction it. State supervision of church schools is a delusion and a snare. A system of divided control never satisfies, if there is a *real division.*

Small churches cannot maintain schools. Large churches will have schools in which priestcraft would enforce, at least among the teachers, a theological tyranny. But the great body of our people who have the greatest respect for religion, and very little interest in creeds and theologies, and upon whom denominational ties sit very lightly, will never surrender our school system to the control of any synod of priests or assembly of ministers, however able, venerable, and beloved they

may be in their various denominations or among their neighbors.

I call your attention to the fact that a large number of eminent and devoted clergymen, laymen, and teachers organized, a few years ago, a Religious Education Association to study this very subject, and I believe that they published a magazine called "Religious Education."

Thus ran the answer:

Nothing that has resulted so far from the publication of my pamphlet on "Socialism in the Schools" has given more pleasure to me than your letter of the twenty-fifth ultimo. It is written in your wonted kindly spirit and with the thoughtfulness that is characteristic of you. I rejoice to find that a man of your training and position in the world of education agrees with me upon the primary proposition that *there is something wrong* with the public school system. In that condition of mind is the hope of amelioration; there is nothing but blank despair in the smug self-satisfaction that prevails among those in charge of the common schools. You go a little farther; you agree with me *as to what is wrong*. You point out the absurdity and criminality of the laborious exclusion from the public schools of all official reference to the fundamentals of Christian religion. So far we fare along the same path; we only diverge when it comes to the remedy. You will pardon me if in this, your chosen field of life-work, I venture to differ with you. I assure you that it is not without trepidation that I do so.

Let us try to settle that matter of definitions first. You think I am wrong in my identification of Socialism as the thing back of the exclusion which we agree is absurd and criminal. You think it is the Jews or the cowardice of politicians in the face of the Jewish vote and Jewish purse. I agree with you that this cowardice is a factor and yesterday I would have agreed with you as to the Jews. It was the Jews yesterday; it was the Catholics the day before; it was the Unitarians

the day before that. But to-day it is Socialism, and the cold and calculating purpose behind it now is of the materialism that underlies socialistic philosophy. For there is a vast difference between what the Unitarians and Catholics tried to do and what Socialism is doing. Horace Mann had an idea of a united homogeneous Protestant Christianity, and backed by the bold and brilliant spirit of New England in his day, he cut out of the schools, not all dogma, not all sectarianism, not all theology, but just so much of each as would level the lines dividing Christians of Protestant inclination. Whether he was mistaken or not, he did have the splendid purpose of upbuilding Christianity as he believed in it. His motive was a constructive motive. Then came the Catholics. As their number increased and their political power and political burdens increased, they rebelled against the Protestant character of the public schools they were taxed to support. They believed in an authorized, dogmatic church just as fervently as did Horace Mann in an undivided Protestantism; every reading of the unauthorized version of the Bible, every additional word in the Lord's Prayer as it was said in the schools, was, to them, an attack upon their faith and the Christ who instituted and sustained it. Behind them, too, was the idea—in its essence the same that impelled Mann—of building up something for the betterment of God's creatures and the glory of God. The next wave was the Jewish wave. As it became strong it reinforced the Catholic protest against the King James Bible and the Protestant version of the Lord's Prayer. It went further: it objected to the Bible and the Prayer altogether. It was not the idea of the orthodox Jew to exclude God: his purpose was to take out of the schools, for whose maintenance *he* was taxed, a false conception of God. Behind his protest was his own ancient and aggressive faith.

Now comes Socialism. And, with its advent, we are face to face with a new proposition. So far the thing behind all the modifications of the educational method was the same thing: it was the worship of God manifest-

ing itself through human nature; and therefore in different forms, as human nature is variform. But behind Socialism there is no worship of God. Behind Socialism is the negation of God. I know that the modern political Socialists profess a purely economic purpose for their movement, but that movement was born of materialistic philosophy and is congenitally and immutably atheistic. I want to be as definite as my limitations, both as to natural capacity and training in dialectics, will allow, so you will pardon me if I tax your patience with a few words upon what I mean by Socialism. Perhaps I can make it more clear by stating what I do not mean. I do not mean, for instance, municipal operation of railroads. If the operation of railroads has become a matter of such general importance that it is a matter of government, then government operation is not Socialism, it is Democracy; it is not a necessary and natural projection of Marx's "materialistic conception of history"; it is the logical thing to do if "the voice of the people is the voice of God." So with the other economic plans now claimed by Socialism, but which have been in the Seed of Democracy. Socialism is n't a political program, it is a dream; and that is what gives it the quality to which I refer when I call it a religion. It differs from the revealed religion in this: that the grave is this side of the dream of Revealed Religion and the other side of the Socialistic dream. The thing that has made Socialism attractive; that has drawn to it so many good men and tender-hearted men who are sick of the injustice of every-day life, is that it is a dream. It is not common ownership of means of production or anything else concrete that gives Socialism its vitality; it is the underlying abstraction, the simulacrum of justice.

It is the square plug for the round hole. The dream of contentment in this world can never be realized. Socialism conflicts with certain unalterable natural conditions. The improvement of economics can never prevent a man from getting a cold in his head. The written statutes can never run against the measles. The purest statesmanship can never abolish thunder-storms and

wintry blasts, nor can it make it as easy for a man to climb up a hill as to fall down. And what economic system will bar the way of Death? How is the Socialistic doctrine of a heaven on earth to be made attractive to a race whose every member marches night and day from the hour of his birth toward his open grave? Religion does n't worry much about this. It says, "The grave is only the open door through which you enter the golden city of God. Justice, the thing you seek, is the other side of the portal." But Socialism must deal with things mundane, and it must impress men with the idea that there is nothing beyond the grave; that the vastly important thing is not Eternal Life, but life in the flesh; and, realizing this, the founders of Socialism as a philosophy enunciated, to meet the needs of their system, "the materialistic conception of history"—there is no life beyond; there is nothing in the wide heavens but matter; there is no God!

As with Death, so with the sex relationship. The regulation of that so as to give general satisfaction is beyond the power of man, so Socialism proclaimed that there should be no regulation; that marriage, like God, was a reflex of economic conditions. So also with the family life, the bonds of affection generated in the family will veto always any plan of human happiness upon a materialistic basis; therefore we find advanced the State cultivation of children; the logic of materialism is inexorable; not to have his heart bruised man must have no loved ones to sicken and die—indeed, he must have no heart. So we come to the end of Socialism as a philosophy, and we find it masquerading, traveling under a false name; for in the final analysis it is the most selfish and sordid and fearful and foolish individualism. The "Social Contract" means, finally, that I exact an agreement from all the other "I's" alive that they will not hurt this sensitive, palpitating mite of matter that means all that is or ever was or ever will be to me.

You can see, then, why it is important to Socialism to drive God out of the schools. If you look abroad you can see that it is doing just that throughout Europe;

wherever it gets control, directly or indirectly, that is the first step. It can't help it. Its essence, the very soul of it, is at eternal war with the spirit of religion.

With this purpose and this motive it reinforced the protest of the Jew; it got behind his political and financial power, and directed the energy it could not of itself generate. And that political and financial cowardice to which you refer has confused the two, the Jew with his faith revealed to his fathers by Jehovah, and the Socialist with his dark Atheism as a substitute for that venerable faith.

Can we meet this thing by compromise? How long will it take the leaders of Christian and Jewish thought to agree upon those things which are fundamental in all religions, not to mention the necessary preliminary of getting the leaders of the various divisions of Christian thought to agree as to what they as Christians shall ask of the Jewish leaders? And when they have been agreed upon, will they serve the purpose?

Compromise always takes some strength away, and for this we need all our strength. It took strength away when Dr. Mann revolutionized the school system of the East; it took strength away when Mann's successors compromised with the Catholic and the Catholic compromised with the Jew, and the Jew in turn compromised with the Socialist. In 1887 Dr. Hodge was appealing for a compromise upon fundamentals; but he appealed for a compromise within Christian lines, for a getting together of the Protestant and the Catholic. To-day you suggest the compromise between the Christian and Jew; but Dr. Hodge's suggestion has not yet been carried out; the Protestants and Catholics have not gotten together yet. The truth is that religion is a matter upon which there can never be a compromise.

Where are you going to fix the line between what is religion and what is theology? Is not your own definition, "Religion is love to God, love to man," beautiful as it is, satisfying as it must be to your heart and intellect, a personal and arbitrary definition after all? Will not some other man have another definition which will suit

him better? Will not the Jew say, "Love to God is not real religion if it manifests itself not in the way prescribed by God?" Will not the Roman Catholic say the same thing and differ with the Jew as to what God has prescribed? Will not the Congregationalist quarrel with the Catholic and the Baptist with the Congregationalist, each reading the word of God according to his own temperamental or intellectual inclination? You may turn to the theologian and say, "But my reason cannot accept any such conception of what God meant." And he will answer you that there are many things your reason cannot comprehend, but which, nevertheless, are true. There cannot be agreement until the minds of men are of equal power for the perception of truth, and for some reason God has not so made them.

But the main thing is not this variform manifestation of the truth; it is that in whatever form it manifests itself it is good. And the stronger it beats in any church, the more fiercely it burns for the creed and practice of any sect, the greater is its moral effect. You think theologies should be taught in the home and you find in the home a weakening of religious feeling, so that it seems that it is being taught neither in the home nor in the school. My own thought is that these two things are as closely related as the Siamese Twins; it is at least a coincidence that loss of positive religious teaching in the schools comes at the same time as the weakening of religious teaching in the home. The days of the "priest-ridden" school knew no such condition in the family circle; when the Bible was a familiar thing in the New England school it was a familiar thing in the New England home; and the effigy of the Crucified Christ that hangs above the head of the freckle-faced little chap in the parochial school hangs also in the bedroom of the mother who teaches him to pray.

Somehow, as I read your letter the first time, that sentence about the weakening of home instruction in religious matters made a particularly deep impression on me. And later, when I read your sentence about "the great body of our people who have the greatest respect

for religion and very little interest in creed or theologies, upon whom denominational ties sit very lightly," my thought leaped back to the remark with regard to religion in the home and tied the two together. And now, as I write this, I wonder how it is that these same relationships do not seem obvious to you; I wonder if there is in my mind some departure from the normal that makes three facts stand out from the body of your letter as if written in characters of fire:

First—that the name of Jesus is banished from the public schools.

Second—that religious teaching is weakened in the home circle.

Third—that the great body of our people have very little interest in creeds and theologies.

Please do not think that I have torn these statements from the context. They spring out at me; they assert their dominance over all else that you have written; they shout at me, "We are the important things."

And they are the important things. Philosophy may be enlightening, but it is not impelling. It may teach us what is right and what is wrong, but it will never compel us to do what is right, and restrain us from doing what is wrong. The need of a living force in ethics is the need that we feel. Not only do we feel it, but everywhere it is felt. I was startled when I picked up the *Outlook* for March 4 to read this by Count Okuma of Japan: "The fatal defect in the teaching of the great sages of Japan and China is that, while they deal in virtue and morals, they do not sufficiently dwell on the spiritual nature of man, and any nation that neglects the spiritual, though it may flourish for a time, must eventually decay. The origin of modern civilization is to be found in the teachings of the Sage of Judea, *by whom alone the necessary moral dynamic is supplied.*"

The Japanese has it. Education, after all, is only light, and light generates no force; you must have heat. You must have inspiration and you can get it nowhere but in religion. And as long as religion runs to creeds, it is through creeds that its inspiration must flow.

What we need, then, is a system which will not be unfair to any creed, but will bring out the good in all. We want a sectarianism such as must develop in our American atmosphere, a sectarianism which will make man pity a fellow because he is of another creed, not hate him. For it must not be forgotten we live in America, and some things that may flourish elsewhere cannot live here. That ecclesiastical tyranny which you apprehend; that could never endure here. Indeed, I wonder sometimes how real it is anywhere. For tyranny implies compulsion; something fixed and inescapable; and throughout the world, except perhaps in Russia, the rule of ecclesiasticism is not fixed and inescapable. I said *perhaps* in Russia because I do not know, as a matter of fact, whether or not it is so fixed and inescapable even under the Czar. But elsewhere the people are "priest-ridden" because they elect to be "priest-ridden." The Catholic has a legal and a moral right as an American citizen to spend his money for a school in which dogmatic religion is taught with other things purely secular, and he not only does spend his money for an institution under ecclesiastical control, but does so with enthusiasm—makes real sacrifices to do so. And that brings me to the suggestion in your letter that the smaller churches could not support schools. There is a little Baptist Church of which I know; some sixty members, all of whom have an earning capacity barely sufficient to keep them going, sustain it in a hostile section of the city; without the aid of fairs and entertainments because they do not believe in such; and these poor men and women have sustained their little church for a dozen years. Unless I know nothing of human nature, that little church would have its school under the plan I suggested in "Socialism in the Schools." The wooden cottage that now serves for a house of worship would serve also for classrooms and they would eke out the sum the State would pay by a little more sacrifice.

Well, I have ridden my hobby far. I really ought to ask you to forgive me for hurling all this at your head, but instead I feel like chiding. Why did you uncork me, Doctor?

But, seriously, I hope for your help. Something must be done. The future of our country means so much to the world.

When I read that letter over, more thoughts occurred to me. I was going to pry apart some of the sentences and insert these thoughts in their natural places, but there flashed into my mind a picture of my friend in his library holding my modest missive in his hand and gazing at it in utter dismay. It bulked too large as it was; so I refrained. But this pamphlet gives me an opportunity, and here shall I write them down in the order in which they occurred to me.

First, then, came the thought of our disagreement about the remedy. It suggested the divisions among the medical schools. Doctors, if they sometimes disagree in diagnoses, more often quarrel about the medicine. Indeed, one school won't play if another prescribes the pills; and is prepared to prove that any cure is accidental should the patient survive. This has been a characteristic attitude of the Residuary Sect. Rather than admit the efficacy of the treatment of other sects, the Residuary Sect will risk the loss of everything. That all sects would be fairly encouraged by any particular plan, makes no appeal to the Residuary Sect, because "all" includes, of course, the sect they dislike. Why should we not do a good thing because it will help another sect? If we want the best out of all sects, why not take the church school? Because it is the bulwark of the Church of Rome is no reason why it should not be the defense of all churches.

Next comes the suggestion about the leveling of creeds to their fundamentals. But the strength of a creed is measured by the hold it has on the believer. A man accepts his creed because he thinks it is the right creed;

how can he honestly consent to the suppression of the very features of it that make it, rather than some other, satisfying to his mind and conscience?

If you believe that God, all-good, all-wise, has prescribed a certain form of worship, what right have you to modify the prescribed form because some other weak and fallible creatures like yourself believe He has prescribed some other form? Your insincere acquiesence in the views of the others will not make them better men, and it will make you a worse man. If you think you are right, stick!

Thoughts are as hard to keep on the straight line as are human beings. They break away very often from the terms to which they are properly married and take up with the gay Lotharios of human expression. We are apt to give respectful attention to "breadth" as if it were something in itself respectable. At its own fireside it is a respectable and worthy thing: a broad sympathy is a fine thing, a broad vision is a fine thing; but a broad religion is nothing at all. The widest possible angle is no angle at all. The last generalization is an infinite thing necessarily too big to fit in a finite thing like a human mind. So "broad" is a decent member of society when it sticks to its mate, but it is a corrupter and a mischief-maker when it runs off, as it often does, with the term "religion." Religion should not be broad, tolerance should be. Religion is the shortest distance between man and God; it should have only one dimension. I would have the religion of men as straight and narrow as the road to Paradise; their sympathy as broad as the need for it.

A little outside our subject, perhaps, is the subject of man's reliance upon his own reason in religious matters; but something suggested it. A fact is a thing altogether independent of a man's recognition of it. A man's rea-

son affects only his recognition of the truth; not the truth itself. If everything true that our reason cannot comprehend were excluded from our knowledge, we should not be allowed to know that we were alive—and some philosophers hold that we do not. In "Hypatia," Kingsley made Raphael Aben Ezra reason quite logically that all external things were mere sensory impressions; reflectively, that he also was a mere sensory impression; and, after that, there was no real test of truth. It was a fine illustration: the man who tests reason by religion is exhibiting common-sense; the man who tests religion by reason is apt to find himself in the end without religion or reason. From the chaos of human speculation, humanity will turn always for relief to the simple declarative faith that says: "I know I am an immortal soul because the great God who made me has told me so."

The prejudice that makes our Residuarians reluctant to do the logical thing drives them always to some illogical expedient. They know that the conscience must be stimulated, and they should know that for conscience there is only one unfailing stimulant; but the Roman Catholic Church uses that, so they seek blindly for some other. It is as if one would say, "My Catholic brother grows fat on roast beef; I 'll spite him by starving myself to death." But they do not like to say that. It sounds as foolish as it is, and no man likes to seem as foolish as he is. So instead of roast beef our Residuarians propose a diet of moonshine. They declare, like Dr. Eliot, that the union of religion and education is a step backward, as if that were in itself a wrong step. When you are on the wrong road, every step backward is a step in the right direction. The most recent moonshine diet is Ethical Education. They are going to teach morals as they teach Latin grammar. Instead of the chorus of "Ten times one is ten," that used to float out

the classroom windows when you and I were young, we shall have a chorus of "Not to steal is good; not to lie is good." But I am afraid that most of the pupils will not remember as long that "Not to steal is good," as they will remember that "Ten times one is ten," because the experience of after-life will be a constant reminder of the truth of the arithmetical declaration, while without the Word of God they will have no reminder of the truth of the ethical lesson. They will remember it as long perhaps as the average school-boy remembers his Latin recitations.

For the trouble with Ethical Education is that it is based upon an untrue hypothesis. Mind and Conscience may be the same thing physiologically—I do not know whether they are or not—but psychologically they are distinct and separate. And Ethical Education assumes that Mind and Conscience are to be developed by the same treatment. It proposes to feed a horse with gasolene because gasolene makes an automobile go. As one of the owners of the horse, I protest.

Many of our friends in the Residuary Sect—indeed, we might very well say all of them—believe Agnosticism is begging for freedom: it is doing nothing of the sort —it is demanding dominion. After the publication of "Socialism in the Schools," a "free thought" periodical printed an editorial comment thereupon, and some one sent a copy to me. It lies on my desk, and I must apologize to my friends for dragging it into the discussion, because, as I look it over, it is n't a very pleasant sort of a sheet. It has the characteristic "soft spots" of socialistic literature; there are discolorations that do not seem healthy, suggesting a diabetic cantaloupe. But it proclaims itself on the front page "a free thought and agnostic newspaper"; it makes numerous demands on its editorial page, two of which read as follows:

We demand that all religious services now sustained by the government shall be abolished; and especially that the use of the Bible in the public schools, *whether ostensibly as a text-book* or avowedly as a book of religious worship, shall be prohibited.

We demand that all laws looking to the enforcement of "Christian" morality shall be abrogated, and that all laws shall be conformed to the requirements of natural morality, equal rights, and impartial liberty.

On another page are these paragraphs:

Dr. J. P. Green of William Jewell College, Liberty, Mo., expresses unusual views for a president of a sectarian establishment. William Jewell is Baptist. President Green lately said to an audience of women in a Kansas City Presbyterian church: "Mind you, I 'm not in favor of teaching the Bible in the public schools. Don't insist on teaching religion to any one who does n't want it, but do insist upon teaching morals. You can teach the basic principles of morality without teaching Christianity."

"If Christianity is unnecessary to the teaching of morals,—then where does religion come in?"

Rather a disconcerting question, is n't it? Rude, slangy, culled from a sheet printed for people with fringy minds, but—can the Residuary Sect answer it?

In Rome, long ago, and in many another city in medieval times, there was a form of punishment selected because of the effect on the public mind. It was inflicted nearly always upon persons of high political and social position; dignitaries degraded by force. It exposed the victim to the lashing laughter of the crowd. He was placed astride a charger with his face toward the tail and, so mounted, was compelled to ride at the end of a column marching through the city. His back was toward the

leader he followed. His face was toward the mocking mob that flung insulting jibes at him.

Residuarian, whom do you follow? You answer me, Christ. But the Catholics follow Christ, and you have turned your back on them. The great leaders of the Protestant movement—the men who would have answered the question of Socialism, quick and hot, when Protestantism was young—they followed Christ; they believed in the mixture of secular and religious education, the marriage of teaching and inspiration; but you have turned your back on them. The distinct pattern of their Christianity shocks your fondness for neutral tints. The lofty eminences of their faith will not bend down to the plain of your "fundamentals." You follow Christ, but the light that shines on your face is not the light of Christianity, the things that fill your vision are not of His church. You look back at the things not of God, and you say that they are Christ-like, but you cannot see Christ. Your view of an un-divine Christ is not the picture of Calvary; it is the incomplete and untrue reflection of that picture in the mind of Atheism.

Can you not hear the sneer and the challenge in this question? You dream of a greater civilization, but it is not civilization that speaks thus; it is the cry of the savage, of the barbarian. Of what use is your religion? Where does it "come in?" Will not a thing like this rouse you? If you are a Christian, face about! Do not march in the Christian column with your back to your Leader! Do not be a Residuarian! For a Residuarian is a Christian who marches backward.

MSH 25647

END OF
TITLE